arXiv:1608.03248v1 [math.OC] 10 Aug 2016

Combinations of Adaptive Filters with Coefficients Feedback

Luiz F. O. Chamon, *Student Member, IEEE,* and Cássio G. Lopes, *Member, IEEE*

***Abstract*—Parallel combinations of adaptive filters have been effectively used to improve the performance of adaptive algorithms and address typical trade-offs, such as the one between convergence rate and steady-state error. In these combinations, the component filters are usually run independently and then combined, which leads to a well known convergence stagnation effect. Conditional transfers of coefficients between filters were introduced in an attempt to handle this issue. This work introduces a more natural way of accelerating convergence to steady-state by cyclically feeding back the overall coefficients to all component filters. Besides coping with convergence stagnation, this new topology allows several adaptive algorithms—e.g., mixed norm, data reusing, and variable step size—to be posed as combinations of simple adaptive filters, bridging an important conceptual gap. Steady-state and tracking analysis accounting for a myriad of component filters are derived for combinations with and without feedback. Transient analyses of the typical convex and affine supervisors are extended to general activation functions and applied to combinations with cyclic coefficients feedback. Numerical examples are provided to illustrate how coefficients feedback can improve the performance of several existing parallel combinations at a small additional computational cost.**

I. Introduction

ADAPTIVE filters (AFs) are widely used due to their model-free nature, nonstationarity tracking capabilities, and—usually—low computational complexity. Nevertheless, AFs have inherent trade-offs that can hinder their application, a notable example being the compromise between convergence rate and steady-state error. Furthermore, several adaptive algorithms—e.g., LMF, RLS, and APA—display stability issues, making their use in real scenarios challenging [1]–[4]. Different techniques have been devised to address these matters, such as data reuse (DR) [5]–[9] and variable step size (VSS) [10]–[14].

More recently, *combinations of AFs* were introduced to address both performance and stability issues when the design of a single filter is intricate [15]–[31]. This approach consists of aggregating a pool of AFs—called *components*—seeking universality, i.e., to make the overall system at least as good—usually in the mean-square error (MSE) sense—as the best filter in the pool. This is usually done using parallel-independent combinations in which the component filters run independently while supervising parameters merge their coefficients (Fig. 1a). This structure remains ubiquitous in the literature and has been studied for different adaptive algorithms, step sizes, orders, and supervisors [15]–[24].

Signal Processing Lab of the Department of Electronic Systems Engineering, University of São Paulo, Brazil. e-mail: chamon@usp.br and cassio@lps.usp.br

Clearly, the supervising parameters play a fundamental role in the combination performance. Indeed, the supervisor must simultaneously track their optimal values and reduce their variance, given that the latter directly impacts the combination behavior and can jeopardize its universality [20], [32]–[34]—see Section VI. The two most commonly used adaptation algorithms for the supervising parameters—referred to as *supervising rules*—are the convex [17] and affine [20] supervisors. The convex supervisor uses a sigmoidal activation function that limits the supervising parameters to the interval $[0, 1]$ and reduces their variance when close to steady-state [17]. The affine rule, on the other hand, does not limit the mixing parameters, which is advantageous since several combinations have negative optimal supervisors [20]. It is, however, less robust and its performance suffers when the difference between the component filters errors becomes large [20], [32]. To address this issue and reduce their sensibility to environmental variations, normalized versions of both rules were proposed [32], [35].

Albeit effective, parallel-independent combinations present a well-known convergence stagnation (Fig. 2) which is independent of the supervising rule. It occurs whenever the faster component has converged and the error of the more accurate component is still larger than its steady-state value. Several structural changes were proposed to address this issue. In [17], *conditional leakages of coefficients* from the faster to the slower component were introduced (Fig. 1b). A similar idea was explored in [28], where the coefficients of the slower filter were conditionally replaced by those of the faster one. A different approach entirely reformulated the topology, leading to *incremental combinations* [25], [27]. Since then, this solution was shown to increase the misadjustment, although displaying faster convergence rate [36], [37].

A more natural solution was put forward in [26] with a structural modification that retains the parallel topology of the combination: the *cyclic coefficients feedback* (Fig. 1c). This technique relies on feeding the overall coefficients back to the component filters, so that they operate over the best coefficients estimate available at each iteration—as evaluated by the supervisor. Besides eliminating the stagnation issue, coefficients feedbacks increase the components cooperation, yielding smaller misadjustments—see Section IV. Also, they have a stabilizing effect on the supervising parameters by reducing their variances—see Section VI.

This work further develops this concept by:

- showing that several individual AFs—e.g., mixed norm, DR, and VSS adaptive algorithms—can be interpreted as combinations with coefficients feedback;



Fig. 1. Parallel topologies: (a) Parallel-independent; (b) Parallel with transfers of coefficients—leakage or handover; (c) Parallel with coefficients feedback.



Fig. 2. Convergence stagnation. Parallel-independent combination of two LMS filters: **white stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 7$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, and $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$; **convex supervisor**: $\mu_a = 200$.

- deriving a general analysis for the steady-state and tracking performance of the parallel combination of different AFs—with and without feedback;
- extending the transient model of the supervisor to general activation functions and using it to analyze the performance of combinations with cyclic feedback;
- comparing through simulations the performance of this new topology to existing methods in the literature [17], [28] and illustrating how it can be employed to straightforwardly improve the performance of existing combinations (e.g., LMS combinations [17], [28], APA combinations [38]–[40], and RLS and LMS [21]).

A. Data model and simulations

AFs can be used in a myriad of setups, such as equalization, inverse control, and prediction. For the purpose of performance analysis and simulation, however, the system identification scenario (Figure 3) is usually adopted as it is representative of applications such as echo cancellation, time delay estimation, and adaptive control [1], [2], [41]–[44]. In this scenario (Fig. 3), u_i is a $1 \times M$ regressor vector that captures samples $u(i)$ of an input signal with variance σ_u^2 and $d(i)$ is a scalar measurement

$$d(i) = u_i w^o + v(i), \tag{1}$$

where the $M \times 1$ vector w^o models the unknown system and $v(i)$ is a zero-mean white Gaussian noise with variance σ_v^2.

The numerical examples throughout this paper use an auxiliary Gaussian i.i.d. random variable $x(i)$ to generate the samples $u(i)$. For *white input data*, $u(i) = x(i)$. To simulate



Fig. 3. System identification scenario.

correlated input data, the following first-order autoregressive [AR(1)] model is adopted

$$u(i) = \gamma\, u(i-1) + \sqrt{1-\gamma^2}\, x(i), \tag{2}$$

for some parameter $0 < \gamma < 1$ [1]. Moreover, when simulating nonstationary environments, the following system model is used

$$w_i^o = w_{i-1}^o + q_i, \tag{3}$$

where $w_{-1}^o = w^o$ is the initial condition of the system being identified and q_i is a zero-mean i.i.d. sequence of $M \times 1$ vectors with covariance matrix $Q = \mathrm{E}\, q_i q_i^T$. Note that the stationary case is recovered for $q_i = 0 \Rightarrow Q = 0$. Unless otherwise noted, all curves are ensemble averages of 300 realizations.

II. Combinations of Adaptive Filters

In a combination of N AFs, the component filters are distinguished using the index $n = 1, \ldots, N$. They each update an $M \times 1$ *a priori* coefficients vector $w_{n,a}$ attempting to minimize some underlying cost function $J_n(w_{n,a})$—usually the MSE $J_n(w_{n,a}) = \mathrm{E}\,|d(i) - u_i w_{n,a}|^2$. For instance, the recursion of the n-th component of the combination could be

$$w_{n,i} = w_{n,a} + \mu_n u_i^T [d(i) - u_i w_{n,a}] \qquad \text{(LMS)} \tag{4a}$$

$$w_{n,i} = w_{n,a} + \mu_n u_i^T [d(i) - u_i w_{n,a}]^3 \qquad \text{(LMF)} \tag{4b}$$

$$w_{n,i} = w_{n,a} + \mu_n U_i^T b_i \qquad \text{(APA)} \tag{4c}$$

$$w_{n,i} = w_{n,a} + P_{n,i} u_i^T [d(i) - u_i w_{n,a}] \qquad \text{(RLS)} \tag{4d}$$

$$P_{n,i} = \lambda_n^{-1} \left[P_{n,i-1} - \frac{\lambda_n^{-1} P_{n,i-1} u_i^* u_i P_{n,i-1}}{1 + \lambda_n^{-1} u_i P_{n,i-1} u_i^*} \right]$$

where μ_n is a step size; b_i is such that $(U_i U_i^T + \epsilon I) b_i = d_i - U_i w_{n,a}$, where $U_i = \begin{bmatrix} u_i^T & \cdots & u_{i-K+1}^T \end{bmatrix}^T$ is a $K \times M$ regressors matrix, $d_i = \begin{bmatrix} d(i) & \cdots & d(i-K+1) \end{bmatrix}^T$ is a $K \times 1$ measurements vector, and $\epsilon \ll 1$ is a regularization factor. $P_{n,i}$ is a recursive estimation of the inverse of the Hessian matrix of $J(\cdot)$, where $P_{-1} = \epsilon^{-1} I$ and λ_n is a forgetting factor. The output of the combination is defined as

$$w_i = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \eta_n(i) w_{n,i}, \tag{5}$$

where w_i is the global coefficient vector and $\{\eta_n(i)\}$ are the supervising parameters, that can be adaptive or not depending on the supervisor [15]–[17], [20], [25], [27], [29].

The *a priori* coefficients in (4) determine the topology of the combination—i.e., how the component filters are connected. Using this concept, a precise definition of parallel combination can be put forward: any combination is said to parallel—or to have *parallel topology*—when all component filters can be simultaneously evaluated, i.e., when the $\{w_{n,a}\}$ only depend on the $\{w_{n,j}\}$, for $j < i$—see Section II-B. Notice that this general formulation can also be used to describe individual AFs recursions and incremental combinations[1].

In the sequel, as proposed in [31], [37], the combinations components and topology are named using a convention inspired by system theory [45]. Parallel combinations are then represented by addition, such that a combination of two LMS filters can be written as LMS + LMS or 2{LMS}. Besides its clarity, this notation avoids the use of long cryptic acronyms to refer to specific combinations.

A. Supervising rules

The supervising rule determines the behavior of the mixing parameters and, consequently, the combination output. A commonly adopted approach is to choose $\{\eta_n(i)\}$ so as to minimize the global MSE $\mathrm{E}\,|e(i)|^2$ under some unbiasedness constraint, with $e(i) = d(i) - u_i w_{i-1}$ being the global output estimation error. For parallel topologies, this constraint is expressed by [17], [20], [46]

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \eta_n(i) = 1, \quad \forall\, i. \tag{6}$$

The two most widely used supervising rules are named *affine* [20] and *convex* [17] due to their supervising parameters constraints. Indeed, the former imposes only (6), whereas the latter enforces the additional condition $\eta_n(i) \in [0, 1]$. Since the extensions for general N is straightforward by using hierarchical combinations [19], [22], both rules are introduced below for $N = 2$. In this case, (5) and (6) reduce to

$$w_i = \eta(i)\, w_{1,i} + [1 - \eta(i)]\, w_{2,i}. \tag{7}$$

The affine supervisor is then written as

$$\eta(i) = \eta(i-1) + \mu_\eta e(i)\,[y_1(i) - y_2(i)]\,, \tag{8}$$

where $y_n = u_i w_{n,i-1}$, and the convex supervisor is given by

$$\eta(i) \triangleq \frac{1}{1 + e^{-a(i)}} \tag{9a}$$

$$a(i) = a(i-1) + \mu_a e(i)\,[y_1(i) - y_2(i)] \times \eta(i-1)\,[1 - \eta(i-1)]\,, \tag{9b}$$

where $a(i)$ is restricted to $[-a^+, a^+]$ so as not to stall the adaptation—usually $a^+ = 4$. To improve the robustness of these supervisors, normalized version were proposed using $\mu_\eta, \mu_a = \tilde{\mu}/p(i)$, where $p(i) = \beta\,|e(i)|^2 + (1-\beta)\,p(i-1)$.

[1]Indeed, for $N = 1$ and $w_{1,a} = w_{1,i-1}$, (4) reduces to the well-known standalone adaptive algorithms [1]. To account for the incremental topology, suffices to take $w_{n,a} = w_{n-1,i}$ with $\eta_n = 0$, $n \neq N$, and $\eta_N = 1$ in (5). These choices then result in a cascade of AFs in which the output of the combination is the output of the last component [25], [36].

B. Parallel topologies and convergence stagnation

The first—and still most common—parallel topology is the *parallel-independent*, where $w_{n,a} = w_{n,i-1}$, i.e., all component filters run independently of each other (Fig. 1a). In this case, their cooperation arises solely from the supervisor's ability to track the best filter in the set and explore the cross-correlation between the AFs errors [17], [20], [21], [33], [46], [47]. This structure, however, displays a well-known convergence stagnation as illustrated in Fig. 2: the overall combination (light green curve) appears to stall as as the faster filter approaches steady-state while the slower filter still has a larger error [17], [20], [21], [26]. Although this effect is most prominent in stationary scenarios, it suggests that this combination's performance can be improved.

Conditional transfers of coefficients were proposed to address this issue[2] (Fig. 1b). First, a *coefficients leakage* scheme was introduced in [17]. Assuming the second filter is slower, the first filter runs independently—$w_{1,a} = w_{1,i-1}$—, whereas the second recursion is changed to—using an LMS filter for illustration

$$w_{2,i} = \alpha[w_{2,i-1} + \mu_2 u_i^T e_2(i)] + (1-\alpha) w_{1,i-1}, \tag{10}$$

with the constant $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Since this perturbation would deteriorate the misadjustment of component 2—and consequently, that of the combination—, it is only enabled while the first filter is converging. Hence, $\alpha \neq 1 \Leftrightarrow \eta(i) > \bar{\alpha}$, for some threshold $\bar{\alpha} \approx 1$. Using the notation from Section II, (10) is equivalent to taking, for the component (4a) and the global coefficients (7):

$$\begin{aligned} w_{1,a} &= w_{1,i-1} \\ w_{2,a} &= \alpha w_{2,i-1} + (1-\alpha) w_{1,i-2} \\ w_i &= \eta w_{1,i} + (1-\eta)[\alpha w_{2,i} + (1-\alpha) w_{1,i-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

This formulation makes it clear that the first component behaves as if the combination were parallel-independent, whereas the component 2 is disturbed by past coefficients of component 1. Moreover, it is clear from the new form of the combination output that, unless α vanishes after filter 2 has attained the steady-state error of filter 1, the combination will be worst than the second filter alone.

Later on, an alternative transfer technique—hereby denoted *coefficients handover*—was proposed in [28]. Once again assuming that component 2 is slower, it cyclically and conditionally assigns $w_{2,i} = w_{1,i}$. Although it uses the same condition as in the coefficients leakage scheme, this solution addressed the convergence stagnation problem more effectively. Moreover, it can also be seen as a complexity reduction technique since upon handover, the second component is not updated [28]. It should be pointed out that when the transfer occurs this combination is not considered parallel by the definition from Section II-B. Indeed, $w_{1,i}$ and $w_{2,i}$ cannot be evaluated simultaneously.

[2]Though outside of the scope of this paper, the incremental topology was also initially motivated as a solution to the convergence stagnation problem [25]. It since has been shown to be better employed to other ends [27], [29], [36].

Though effective, these methods have downsides from an application point of view. Firstly, they require conditional tests on every iteration—or at least on some iteration for the coefficients handover method. Secondly, these methods rely on unidirectional transfers—i.e., from filter 1 to filter 2, although there is little guarantee in practice that filter 1 will always be faster—e.g., in non-stationary or low signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) environments. This problem is further accentuated in combinations of $N > 2$ AFs.

III. Cyclic Coefficients Feedback

Coefficients feedback was proposed as an improved solution to the convergence stagnation that also addresses the concerns present at the end of Section II-B. This approach consists of using the global weights from (5) as the *a priori* coefficients of all component filters—i.e., $w_{n,a} = w_{i-1}$ (Fig. 1c). This means that all filters in the combination operate over the best current estimate of w^o, as evaluated by the supervisor [26].

Notice that, since all filters update the same coefficients vector, the difference between their outputs $y_n(i)$ is reduced. This slows down the supervisor adaptation, which depends on this difference—see (8), (9), or the form for general activation functions in (18). To address this issue, feedbacks are made cyclically every L iterations, where L is a scalar constant that defines the *cycle period*. Explicitly,

$$w_{n,a} = \delta(i - rL)w_{i-1} + [1 - \delta(i - rL)]\, w_{n,i-1}, \qquad (11)$$

where $\delta(i)$ is the Kronecker delta and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that the overall combination has two limiting behaviors depending on the cycle period: (i) for $L = 1$, (11) reduces to $w_{n,a} = w_{i-1}$ and the global coefficients are always fed back to the components; (ii) for $L \to \infty$, (11) becomes $w_{n,a} = w_{n,i-1}$ and the usual parallel-independent combination from Section II-B is recovered. A procedure to design the cycle period was proposed in [26] based on the transient performance of the component filters in stationary scenarios. Simulations show, however, that the overall performance is robust to L and remains the same for a considerable range of values—see Section IV-B.

Conceptually, this new topology is more natural than transfers of coefficients as it provides the components with the global coefficients—evaluated by the supervisor to minimize the global MSE. Moreover, it bridges a gap between combinations of AFs and mixed-norm, DR, and VSS algorithms—see Section III-A. In terms of performance, besides avoiding convergence stagnation (Fig. 4), it can improve the global misadjustment, specially in nonstationary scenarios. It is therefore an effective (and computationally simple) way to improve parallel combinations, such as the APA + APA from [40] (Fig. 5). The feedbacks also have the side-effect of stabilizing the combination by reducing the supervising parameters variance—Section VI. Finally, in contrast to the structures presented in Section II-B, cyclic coefficients feedbacks are neither directional nor limited to any pair of filters and are fit for efficient interruption-based implementations.



Fig. 4. Comparison between coefficients leakage, handover, and feedback under abrupt nonstationarity ({LMS + LMS}). **White input data** (see Section I-A): $M = 7$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$, $\mu_1 = 0.07$, $\mu_2 = 0.007$, and $w^o \to -w^o$ at $i = 1500$; **coefficients leakage**: $\alpha = 0.95$ for $\eta \geq 0.98$ and $\alpha = 0$ otherwise, $\mu_a = 200$ (convex supervisor); **coefficients handover**: $L_2 = 10$, handover when $\eta \geq 0.98$, $\mu_a = 250$ (convex supervisor); **cyclic coefficients feedback**: $L_3 = 50$, $\mu_a = 300$ (convex supervisor).



Fig. 5. Improving $\{\text{APA} + \text{APA}\}$ and $DR - \{\text{LMS}\}^N$ combinations using coefficients feedback. **White stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 100$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, and $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-3}$; **APA**: $\mu_1 = 0.3$, $K_1 = 10$, $\mu_2 = 0.3$, and $K_2 = 1$; **Parallel-independent**: $\mu_a = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.95$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$ (normalized convex supervisor); **Cyclic coefficients feedback**: $L = 400$, $\mu_a = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.95$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$ (normalized convex supervisor).

A. Adaptive algorithms as combinations of AFs

A myriad of adaptive algorithms can be motivated as combinations of AFs. Indeed, adaptation rules involving mixed-norm, DR, and VSS intuitively fit this framework. Nevertheless, they could not be expressed as combinations prior to the introduction of coefficients feedback. Such interpretation bridges a conceptual gap between AFs mixtures and celebrated algorithms in the standalone adaptive filtering literature. The remainder of this section illustrates how the latter can be recast in a combination setting.

1) Mixed-norm algorithms: These AFs were put forward as solutions to minimization problems involving convex combinations of different moments of the output estimation error [48]–[51]. For instance, the Least Mean Mixed-Norm (LMMN) algorithm [48] minimizes the cost function

$$J(w) = \mathrm{E}\left[\delta\,|e(i)|^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1-\delta)\,|e(i)|^4\right],$$

where $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ is a mixing constant, using

$$w_i = w_{i-1} + \mu u_i^T e(i)\left\{\delta + (1-\delta)\,|e(i)|^2\right\}. \qquad (12)$$

The algorithm in (12) can be posed as an LMS + LMF combination with coefficients feedback. Notice that, in this case, the coefficients are fed back every iteration—i.e., $L = 1$ in (11) so that $w_{n,a} = w_{i-1}$—and the supervisor is not adaptive—i.e., $\eta(i) = \delta$ in (7). Extensions to other mixed-norm algorithms, such as the LMS+F [49], [50] and the Robust Mixed-Norm (RMN) [51], are straightforward. Notice that similar arguments can be used for algorithms that are not mixed-norm, but can be motivated as combinations. For instance, the IPNLMS [52] can be seen as a parallel combination of an NLMS and a PNLMS with coefficients feedback. A similar idea was explored in [53] in which a heuristics to switch between the AFs was proposed instead of a supervisor as those in Section II-A.

2) Data reuse algorithms: DR in adaptive filtering refers either to the simultaneous use of different data pairs $\{u_{i-k}, d(i-k)\}$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$, or to the use of a single data pair K times. This work is concerned with the former case, as the latter can only be described using incremental combinations [27]. For instance[3],

$$w_i = w_{i-1} + \mu U_i^T e_i \qquad \text{(TRUE-LMS)} \qquad (13a)$$

$$w_i = w_{i-1} + \mu U_i^T N_i e_i \qquad \text{(TRUE-NLMS)} \qquad (13b)$$

where $e_i = d_i - U_i w_{i-1}$, $\{U_i, d_i\}$ are defined as in (4), and $N_i = \operatorname{diag}\left\{1/\|u_i\|^2, \ldots, 1/\|u_{i-K+1}\|^2\right\}$. For illustration, the TRUE-LMS filter in (13a) is considered in the sequel.

To determine the combination equivalent to (13a), start by rewriting its recursion as

$$w_i = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{K} \underbrace{\left\{w_{i-1} + \mu' u_{i-k}^T \left[d(i-k) - u_{i-k} w_{i-1}\right]\right\}}_{w_{k+1,i}}, \qquad (14)$$

where $\mu' = \mu K$. Then, notice that (14) has the form of a parallel combination (5), taking $\eta_n(i) = 1/K$ and $\{w_{n,i}\}$ as indicated. Finally, extending the concept of DR combinations from [27] to parallel topologies, the DR AF in (13a) can be seen as a combination of delayed LMS filters with coefficients feedback. Explicitly,

$$w_{n,i} = w_{i-1} + \mu' u_{i-k'}^T \left[d(i-k') - u_{i-k'} w_{i-1}\right] \qquad (15a)$$

$$w_i = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \eta_n w_{n,i}, \qquad (15b)$$

for $N = K$, $k' = n-1$, and $\eta_n = 1/K$. Once again, the global coefficients are constantly fed back, i.e., $L = 1$. A similar argument can be applied to (13b) to find that it corresponds to a combination of delayed NLMS filter.

3) Variable step size algorithms: Whenever AFs with the same update and different step sizes are combined using the coefficients feedback structure, the resulting overall algorithm reduces to a VSS version of this filters [26]. Indeed, for $L = 1$ in (11) and denoting the adaptive algorithm update direction as $p(w_{i-1})$, (5) yields

$$w_i = w_{i-1} + \bar{\mu}(i) p(w_{i-1}), \qquad (16)$$

where $\bar{\mu}(i) \triangleq \sum \eta_n(i)\mu_n$ is an iteration dependent affine—or convex—combination of the components step sizes $\{\mu_n\}$. Given that $\bar{\mu}(i)$ is adjusted by the supervisor, the complexity and robustness of this VSS algorithm depends on the supervising rule, making (16) a viable alternative to other step size adaptation rules, such as [10]–[13]. Indeed, Fig. 6 shows that an $\{\text{LMS} + \text{LMS}\}$ combination with cyclic coefficients feedback is more robust to environment changes than the VSS-LMS from [11]. It is able to track the optimal step-size in stringent nonstationary scenarios with low complexity—see Fig. 12.



Fig. 6. Comparison between the VSS-LMS and the $\{\text{LMS} + \text{LMS}\}$ with coefficients feedback. **White input data** (see Section I-A): $M = 10$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, and $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-3}$; $\sigma_v^2 \to 10^{-1}$ at $i = 1500$; **VSS-LMS** [11]: $\mu(i) = 0.99 \cdot \mu(i-1) + 10^{-3} \cdot e^2(i)$, $\mu_{\min} = 0.005$, and $\mu_{\max} = 0.05$; **Coefficients feedback**: $\mu_1 = 0.005$, $\mu_2 = 0.05$, $L = 40$, $\mu_a = 1$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$ (normalized convex supervisor).

IV. Steady-State and Tracking Performance

In this section, the asymptotic behavior of combinations of AFs with cyclic coefficients feedback is studied. First, the different steady-state regimes of the structure are introduced and a global analysis of the parallel combination output is developed—Section IV-A. Then, general forms of the required second-order error statistics are simultaneously evaluated for stationary and nonstationary scenarios using an energy conservation argument similar to [1]—Section IV-C and IV-D. Finally, a method to determine the steady-state values of the supervising parameters is presented—Section IV-E. Recall that even though all derivations are carried out for two component filters, the results are easily extendable to the case of N AFs by evaluating the additional statistics or using hierarchical combinations [19], [22].

Before proceeding, the following data model assumptions are adopted to render derivations tractable:

A.1 (*Noise independence*) $\{u(i), v(j)\}$ are independent for all i, j.

A.2 (*Random walk independence*) The random variable q_i is statistically independent of the initial conditions $\{w_{-1}^o, w_{-1}\}$, of $\{u_j, v(j)\}$ for all i, j, and of $\{d(j)\}$ for $j < i$.

Notice that these are usual assumptions in the adaptive filtering literature [1], [2], [17], [21].

Also, to provide a flexible framework for analyses, take the following general forms for the component filters and

[3]These AFs are sometimes called DR-LMS and DR-NLMS [9]. However, these names are also used to denote algorithms which operate several times over the same data pair as in [5], [6]. To avoid this confusion, new names were proposed in [27] due to their similarity to true gradient approaches in distributed estimation [54].

supervising rule recursions:

$$w_{n,i} = w_{n,a} + \mu_n u_i^T g_n[d(i) - u_i w_{n,a}] \quad (17)$$

$$a(i) = a(i-1) + \mu_a e(i)\,[y_1(i) - y_2(i)]\,f'[a(i-1)]. \quad (18)$$

In (17), μ_n is again a scalar step size and g_n is a—possibly nonlinear—positive-valued functions that can be used to recover a myriad of adaptive algorithms, such as the LMS for $g_n[x] = x$; the NLMS for $g_n[x] = x/\|u_i\|^2$; the LMF for $g_n[x] = x^3$; and the sign-error LMS for $g_n[x] = \text{sign}[x]$. For the sake of clarity, combinations involving RLS filters are studied separately in Section V-C and V-D using $g_n[x] = x$ and replacing μ_n by $P_{n,i}$ as in (4d). The recursion in (18) accounts for different supervising rules using $\eta(i) = f[a(i)]$ for some general activation functions f with derivative $f' > 0$.[4] Both convex (9) and affine (8) supervisors can be recovered by choosing $f(a)$ as in (9a) with $f' = \eta(1-\eta)$ and $f(a) = a$ with $f' = 1$, respectively.

Finally, define the coefficients error $\widetilde{w}_i = w_i^o - w_i$ and $\widetilde{w}_{n,i} = w_i^o - w_{n,i}$, as well as the EMSEs

$$\zeta(i) = \mathrm{E}\, e_a^2(i) \qquad \text{(global EMSE)}$$

$$\zeta_n(i) = \mathrm{E}\, e_{a,n}^2(i), \text{ for } n = 1, 2 \qquad \text{(local EMSE)}$$

$$\zeta_{12}(i) = \mathrm{E}\, e_{a,1}(i) e_{a,2}(i) \qquad \text{(cross-EMSE)}$$

where $e_a(i) = u_i(w_i^o - w_{i-1})$ and $e_{a,n}(i) = u_i(w_i^o - w_{n,i-1})$ are the global and local *a priori* errors, respectively. The steady-state values of these figures of merit are indicated by omitting the index i—e.g., $\zeta_n = \lim_{i\to\infty} \zeta_n(i)$.

A. Global steady-state analysis

In combinations of AFs, two types of asymptotic behavior can be distinguished:

Definition 1 (Local steady-state)**.** A combination of AFs is said to operate at steady-state *locally* if $\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{m,i}\widetilde{w}_{n,i} = \mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{m,i-1}^T\widetilde{w}_{n,i-1}$, for all m, n and as $i \to \infty$.

Definition 2 (Global steady-state)**.** A combination of AFs is said to operate at steady-state *globally* if $\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_i\|^2 = \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|^2$, as $i \to \infty$.

As is usually the case, the derivations in the sequel are primarily interested in global steady-state performance measures. However, it is not always practical to analyze the overall combination directly, such as with parallel-independent structures—$L \to \infty$. Nevertheless, it is straightforward to show that Def. 1 always implies Def.2. The converse, in contrast, only holds in specific cases—as argued in Section IV-B.

Proceeding, under either steady-state regimes from Def. 1 and 2, global figures of merit can be related to statistics of the supervising parameter and components errors. To do so, subtract the output of the combination (7) at $i-1$ from w_i^o to get

$$w_i^o - w_{i-1} = \eta(i-1)\,(w_i^o - w_{1,i-1}) + [1-\eta(i-1)]\,(w_i^o - w_{2,i-1}). \quad (19)$$

[4]This constraint ensures that the adaptation algorithm never stalls—i.e., that there is no a for which $f'(a)$ vanishes and the supervising parameter becomes independent of the component filters. Recall that this condition is imposed on the convex supervisor by limiting the value of a.

Then, multiplying (19) by u_i from the left, squaring, and taking the expected value yields the global EMSE

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(i) = {} & \mathrm{E}\,\eta^2(i-1)\, e_{a,1}^2(i) \\ & + 2\,\mathrm{E}\,\eta(i-1)[1-\eta(i-1)]\, e_{a,1}(i) e_{a,2}(i) \\ & + \mathrm{E}[1-\eta(i-1)]^2\, e_{a,2}^2(i).\end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

At this point, it is common in the combination literature to adopt some sort of supervisor separation principle to decouple the analysis of the component filters from that of the overall combination. Additionally, the variance of the supervisor is assumed to vanish at steady-state to simplify the derivations [17], [20], [21], [32], [47].

A.3 (*Steady-state supervisor separation principle*) At steady-state, $\eta(i)$ varies slowly compared to the coefficients error $\widetilde{w}_{n,i}$ and the *a priori* errors $e_{a,n}(i)$, so that their expected values can be separated as in $\mathrm{E}[\eta(i)\widetilde{w}_{n,i}] = \mathrm{E}\,\eta(i)\,\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{n,i}$ and $\mathrm{E}[\eta(i)e_{a,n}(i)] = \mathrm{E}\,\eta(i)\,\mathrm{E}\,e_{a,n}(i)$, $i \to \infty$.[5]

A.4 (*Small variance assumption*) The variance of $\eta(i)$ becomes negligible as $i \to \infty$, so that $\mathrm{E}\,\eta^2(i) \approx [\mathrm{E}\,\eta(i)]^2$.

Both assumptions are supported by simulations and have been successfully applied to the steady-state analysis of both affine [20], [32], [47] and convex [17], [21] supervisors. Moreover, notice that for supervisors as in (18), A.4 implies that f' and/or the difference between the output of the components—or, equivalently, their errors—vanish at steady-state. This is indeed the case for the convex supervising rule and sufficiently small μ_a, although it has been observed to remain accurate for a larger range of step sizes and different activation functions [17], [20], [21], [32], [47]. When coefficients feedbacks are used, A.4 is further supported by the fact that they can reduce the supervising parameters variance—see Section VI.

Hence, under A.3 and A.4, (20) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(i) = {} & \bar{\eta}^2\,\zeta_1(i) \\ & + 2\bar{\eta}[1-\bar{\eta}(i-1)]\,\zeta_{12}(i) \\ & + [1-\bar{\eta}]^2\,\zeta_2(i), \quad \text{as } i \to \infty,\end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\bar{\eta} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\,\bar{\eta}(i)$ is the steady-state value of the mean supervising parameter—which is studied in Section IV-E.

A similar relation can be obtained for the coefficients error by subtracting (7) from w_i^o and taking the expected value of its squared norm under A.3 and A.4:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_i\|^2 = {} & \bar{\eta}^2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{1,i}\|^2 \\ & + 2\bar{\eta}[1-\bar{\eta}]\,\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i}^T\widetilde{w}_{2,i} \\ & + [1-\bar{\eta}]^2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{2,i}\|^2, \quad \text{as } i \to \infty.\end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

B. Cyclic feedback and steady-state

For relations (21) and (22) to hold, the quantities involved must have steady-state values, i.e., as $i \to \infty$, all error and supervisor statistics involved need to converge to fixed values. With cyclic coefficients feedback, however, this does not occur even if the combination is stable—i.e., does not diverge. Indeed, in the case where $1 < L < \infty$, the topology varies

[5]This assumption can also be stated in terms of the conditional independence of the variables given $\eta_n(i)$ [33]. Assumption A.10 in the transient analysis of Section VI is stated in this way.



Fig. 7. {LMS + LMS} with cyclic coefficients feedback for $L = 50$. **White stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 7$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$, $\mu_1 = 0.005$, and $\mu_2 = 0.05$; **convex supervisor**: $\mu_a = 300$.



Fig. 8. {LMS + LMS} with cyclic coefficients feedback for $L = 1$. **White stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 7$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$, $\mu_1 = 0.005$, and $\mu_2 = 0.05$; **convex supervisor**: $\mu_a = 200$.



Fig. 9. {LMS+LMS} with cyclic coefficients feedback for $L \to \infty$ (parallel-independent). **White stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 7$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$, $\mu_1 = 0.005$, and $\mu_2 = 0.05$; **convex supervisor**: $\mu_a = 200$.

with time, alternating between a parallel-independent and a coefficients feedback structure—see Section III. Hence, the combination does not reach a stationary form as $i \to \infty$ and is therefore constantly operating in transient regime (Fig. 7). In contrast, the limiting cases $L \to \infty$ and $L = 1$ have static topologies, implying that the combination converges as $i \to \infty$ (Fig. 8 and 9).

To account for the $1 < L < \infty$ situation without resorting to a full transient analysis—as in Section VI—, notice that the limiting conditions analyses provide performance bounds for



(a) (b)

Fig. 10. Steady-state and tracking performance of the {LMS + LMS} with cyclic coefficients feedback for different cycle lengths ($M = 5$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1/M$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$). (a) **White stationary scenario**: $\mu_1 = 0.07$, and $\mu_2 = 0.01$; **affine supervisor**: $\mu_\eta = 0.7$, $\eta_{min} = -0.15$. (b) **Correlated nonstationary scenario**: $\gamma = 0.8$, $Q = 2 \cdot 10^{-6} R_u^{-1}$, $\mu_1 = 0.04$, $\lambda_2 = 0.92$, and $\epsilon_2 = 10^{-6}$; **convex supervisor**: $\mu_a = 100$. Averaged over 1000 iterations.

the general cyclic case. Also, recall that the global coefficients are only fed back cyclically so as not to disturb the supervisor adaptation. Hence, only the performance for small L are of interest in practice, so that the following approximation holds:

A.5 (*Small cycle period*) For small cycle period, the steady-state performance of the overall combination is the same as if $L = 1$.

This assumption can be motivated by observing that at steady-state and for reduced cycle periods, the components and the supervisor are unable to significantly alter their coefficients and parameters between feedbacks. Note that the converse also holds: as the cycle period becomes larger, the components become unable to take advantage of the global coefficients and the combination behaves as if the AFs were independent. Finally, simulations suggest that A.5 is valid for a significant range of L. This phenomenon is illustrated in Figure 10, where the dashed lines indicate a 1 dB gap from the coefficients feedback ($L = 1$) steady-state.

In view of these arguments, the following analyses are derived for combinations where $L \to \infty$ and $L = 1$. Notice that, due to our energy conversation approach, only A.2 is assumed in the derivations of the component filters error statistics.

C. Variance and covariance relations for $L \to \infty$

Parallel-independent combinations—i.e., $L \to \infty$ in (11)—involving components such as LMS, RLS, and LMF filters have been analyzed in the literature for both affine and convex supervisors [17], [19]–[24], [32]–[34]. Nevertheless, the following derivations provide a unified framework for the analysis of this structure, accounting for a wider variety of components by means of the general AF model in (17).

From (11), $L \to \infty \Rightarrow w_{n,a} = w_{n,i-1}$, $\forall\, i$, so that (17) simplifies to

$$w_{n,i} = w_{n,i-1} + \mu_n u_i^T g_n[e_n(i)], \tag{23}$$

where $e_n(i) = d(i) - u_i w_{n,i-1}$ is the n-th component output estimation error. Subtracting (23) from w_i^o and noticing that the nonstationarity model (3) implies that $w_i^o - w_{n,i-1} = \widetilde{w}_{n,i-1} + q_i$ gives

$$\widetilde{w}_{n,i} = \widetilde{w}_{n,i-1} + q_i - \mu_n u_i^T g_n, \tag{24}$$

in which the argument of g_n was omitted for clarity's sake. Taking the expected value of the squared norm of (24) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{n,i}\|^2 &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{n,i-1}\|^2 + \mathrm{Tr}(Q)\\ &\quad - 2\mu_n\,\mathrm{E}\,e_{a,n}(i)\,g_n + \mu_n^2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2\,g_n^2,\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\mathrm{E}\,\|q_i\|^2 = \mathrm{Tr}(Q)$ and all terms depending linearly on q_i vanish due to A.2. Similarly, cross-multiplying (24) for $n = 1, 2$ and taking the expectation gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i}^T\widetilde{w}_{2,i} &= \mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i-1}^T\widetilde{w}_{2,i-1} + \mathrm{Tr}(Q)\\ &\quad - \mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,e_{a,2}(i)\,g_1 - \mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,e_{a,1}(i)\,g_2\\ &\quad + \mu_1\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2\,g_1\,g_2.\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

To proceed, notice that, since there is no feedback, all of the above recursions depend uniquely on local quantities—i.e., $w_{n,i-1}$. In other words, the components are uncoupled and operate as if there were no combination. Hence, local steady-state becomes a necessary condition for global steady-state to be achieved for an arbitrary η. These observations imply that Def. 1 and 2 are equivalent, which allows the the usual steady-state assumption to be employed to obtain the variance and covariance relations for combinations without feedback. Explicitly, under Def. 1, (21), (25), and (26) become, as $i \to \infty$,

$$\zeta = \overline{\eta}^2\,\zeta_1 + 2\overline{\eta}[1-\overline{\eta}]\,\zeta_{12} + [1-\overline{\eta}]^2\,\zeta_2 \tag{27a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_n\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2 g_n^2[e_n(i)] + \mu_n^{-1}\,\mathrm{Tr}(Q) =\\ 2\,\mathrm{E}\,e_{a,n}(i)\,g_n[e_n(i)]\end{aligned} \tag{27b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2 g_1[e_1(i)]g_2[e_2(i)] + \mathrm{Tr}(Q) =\\ \mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,e_{a,2}(i)\,g_1[e_1(i)] + \mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,e_{a,1}(i)\,g_2[e_2(i)].\end{aligned} \tag{27c}$$

Notice that (27b) is equivalent to the variance relation deduced in [1, Thm. 6.4.1], which is used to derive the steady-state performance of several adaptive algorithms. In fact, quantities ζ_1 and ζ_2 could be replaced by any of the well-known formulae for the mean-square behavior of AFs [1], [2]. The covariance relation (27c), on the other hand, introduces a novel unified framework upon which the cross-EMSE of several AFs can be evaluated. In summary, (27) allows the steady-state global EMSE to be evaluated for combinations without feedback involving a myriad of component filters.

D. Variance and covariance relations for $L = 1$

Although the last section provided a new view on established results, the derivations in the sequel apply to the coefficients feedback topology introduced in this work. Indeed, for $L = 1$, (11) reduces to $w_{n,a} = w_{i-1}$ for all i, i.e., the global coefficients are fed back to the components at every iteration. Explicitly, (17) becomes

$$w_{n,i} = w_{i-1} + \mu_n u_i^T g_n[e(i)]. \tag{28}$$

Recall that $e(i) = d(i) - u_i w_{i-1}$ is the global output estimation error from Section II-A.

As in Section IV-C, (28) is subtracted from w_i^o to yield

$$\widetilde{w}_{n,i} = \widetilde{w}_{i-1} + q_i - \mu_n u_i^T g_n[e(i)], \tag{29}$$

where the relation $w_i^o - w_{i-1} = \widetilde{w}_{i-1} + q_i$ deduced from (3) was employed. Finally, recursions for the variance and covariance of (29) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{n,i}\|^2 &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|^2 + \mathrm{Tr}(Q)\\ &\quad - 2\mu_n\,\mathrm{E}\,e_a(i)g_n[e(i)] + \mu_n^2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2 g_n^2[e(i)]\end{aligned} \tag{30a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i}^T\widetilde{w}_{2,i} &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|^2 + \mathrm{Tr}(Q)\\ &\quad - \mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,e_a(i)g_1[e(i)] - \mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,e_a(i)g_2[e(i)]\\ &\quad + \mu_1\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2 g_1[e(i)]\,g_2[e(i)].\end{aligned} \tag{30b}$$

Once again, all terms depending linearly on q_i vanished due to A.2.

Notice that the recursions in (30) differ from their counterparts (25) and (26) in that they both depend on the norm of the global coefficients $\|w_{i-1}\|^2$. In turn, this norm is a function of $\|w_{n,i-1}\|^2$, $w_{1,i-1}^T w_{2,i-1}$, and second-order statistics of $\eta(i-1)$, which effectively couples (30a) and (30b) so that the component filters are no longer independent. These observations suggest that the analysis can be carried on directly under global steady-state. It is important to notice that each component filter updates the global coefficients w_{i-1}, which indicates that global steady-state implies local steady-state—although the asymptotic behavior in this case is different from the one in Section IV-C. Once again, Def. 1 and 2 are, therefore, equivalent.

Proceeding, substitute (30) in the steady-state relation (22) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_i\|^2 &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|^2 + \mathrm{Tr}(Q)\\ &\quad - 2\overline{\eta}\mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,e_a(i)g_1 - 2(1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,e_a(i)g_2\\ &\quad + \overline{\eta}\mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\|u_i\|^2 g_1\left[\,\overline{\eta}\mu_1 g_1 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2 g_2\,\right]\right\}\\ &\quad + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\|u_i\|^2 g_2\left[\,\overline{\eta}\mu_1 g_1 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2 g_2\,\right]\right\},\end{aligned}$$

which under Def. 2 yields the variance relation for combinations with coefficients feedback. Explicitly, as $i \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\overline{\eta}\mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\|u_i\|^2 g_1\left[\,\overline{\eta}\mu_1 g_1 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2 g_2\,\right]\right\}\\ &+ (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\|u_i\|^2 g_2\left[\,\overline{\eta}\mu_1 g_1 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2 g_2\,\right]\right\} + \mathrm{Tr}(Q) =\\ &\qquad 2\overline{\eta}\mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,e_a(i)g_1 + 2(1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,e_a(i)g_2,\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where the argument of g_n—i.e., $e(i)$—has been omitted for clarity.

Due to feedback, a single variance relation for the global error is obtained, in contrast to the variance and covariance relations required for each component filters in parallel-independent combinations. Actually, the combination can now be interpreted as a single AF whose optimization problem is determined by the supervising parameter η—as illustrated in Section III-A. Hence, (31) is in fact a generalization of the variance relation for individual AFs [1, Thm. 6.4.1]. The introduction of coefficients feedback has, therefore, allowed for an explicit interpretation of energy transfer between global *a priori* and global *a posteriori* errors.

E. Supervisor analysis

The steady-state and tracking performance of combinations with and without feedback can be evaluated for arbitrary values of the supervising parameter using (27) and (31). Suffices, then, to determine $\bar{\eta}$, which is carried out in this section for adaptation rules of the form (18). To do so, an approximate recursion for $\mathrm{E}\, a(i)$ is derived and its stationary points are used to evaluate $\bar{\eta}$. Notice that similar results exist for parallel-independent combinations using convex and affine supervisors [17], [20]. However, the following derivations are valid for a larger class of activation functions.

First, obtain from (1) and (7) the relations

$$\begin{aligned} y_1(i) - y_2(i) &= e_{a,2}(i) - e_{a,1}(i) \\ e(i) &= \eta(i-1)\, e_{a,1}(i) + [1-\eta(i-1)]\, e_{a,2}(i) + v(i), \end{aligned}$$

which applied to the supervisor model (18) yields

$$\begin{aligned} a(i) = a(i-1) + \mu_a \Big\{ & [\,1 - f(a)\,] f'(a) e_{a,2}^2(i) \\ & + [\,2f(a) - 1\,] f'(a) e_{a,1}(i) e_{a,2}(i) - f(a) f'(a) e_{a,1}^2(i) \\ & + f'(a)[e_{a,2}(i) - e_{a,1}(i)] v(i) \Big\}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where all $f(\cdot)$ are evaluated at $a(i-1)$. Moreover, the dependence on the activation function is stressed in (32) by writing $\eta(i-1) = f[a(i-1)]$. Then, proceeding similarly to [33], all terms dependent on f in (32) are approximated by their first-order Taylor expansions around $\bar{a}(i-1) = \mathrm{E}\, a(i-1)$. Explicitly, (32) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} a(i) \approx a(i-1) + \mu_a \big\{ & \mathcal{A}_2 e_{a,2}^2(i) + \mathcal{A}_{12} e_{a,1}(i) e_{a,2}(i) \\ & - \mathcal{A}_1 e_{a,1}^2(i) + \mathcal{A}_v [e_{a,2}(i) - e_{a,1}(i)] v(i) \big\} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 &\approx \bar{f}\bar{f}' + \left[(\bar{f}')^2 + \bar{f}\bar{f}''\right](a - \bar{a}) \\ \mathcal{A}_2 &\approx (1-\bar{f})\bar{f}' + \left[-(\bar{f}')^2 + (1-\bar{f})\bar{f}''\right](a - \bar{a}) \\ \mathcal{A}_{12} &\approx (2\bar{f} - 1)\bar{f}' + \left[2(\bar{f}')^2 + (2\bar{f} - 1)\bar{f}''\right](a - \bar{a}) \\ \mathcal{A}_v &\approx \bar{f}' + \bar{f}''(a - \bar{a}) \end{aligned}$$

where f'' is the second derivative of f and for any function h: $\bar{h} = h[\bar{a}(i-1)]$.

It is straightforward to see that under A.3 and A.1, the expected value of recursion (33) reaches a stationary point—i.e., $\bar{a}(i) = \bar{a}(i-1) = \bar{a}$—if and only if the following relation holds

$$\underbrace{[\,\Delta\zeta_2 - (\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2) f(\bar{a})\,]}_{\mathcal{P}}\, f'(\bar{a}) = 0, \text{ as } i \to \infty, \quad (34)$$

where $\Delta\zeta_n = \zeta_n - \zeta_{12}$. Given that f' is infinitely supported by assumption—see (18)—, (34) can only be met when $\mathcal{P}$ vanishes, i.e., for

$$\bar{\eta} = f(\bar{a}) = \frac{\Delta\zeta_2}{\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2}. \quad (35)$$

Even though (35) is independent of the topology—as long as the supervising rule follows the form (18)—, it requires knowledge of the $\Delta\zeta_n$ at steady-state. This not an issue in parallel-independent structures, given that these values are readily available from (27). In contrast, expressing these quantities in combinations with coefficients feedback is intricate, as the local—(30)—and global—(31)—coefficients error recursions are coupled. To address this matter, notice that (35) is actually the supervising parameter value which minimizes the global MSE at steady-state [17], [20]. In other words, it is the optimal supervising parameter in the global MSE sense. Hence, $\bar{\eta}$ can be determined, in the coefficients feedback case, using

A.6 (*Steady-state mean supervisor*) As in parallel-independent combinations, the steady-state value of the mean supervising parameter for combinations with coefficients feedback—$L = 1$—is the optimal one in the global MSE sense—i.e., it is the value of $\bar{\eta}$ which minimizes ζ.

Similar assumptions have been used in the analysis of parallel-independent combinations [17], [20], which sometimes take the more stringent assumption that the mean value of the supervising parameter is optimal for all i [55]. Moreover, notice that $\bar{\eta}$ could be evaluated using the transient analysis from Section VI. This approach, however, is more demanding and yields similar results to using A.6, as illustrated by the simulations in Section I-A.

V. Performance of Specific Combinations

In this section, the results from Section IV are used to analyze the performance of combinations involving different component filters. Hence, although the assumptions adopted so far were mostly related to the supervisor analysis—A.3, A.4, A.5, and A.1—, new ones are required to evaluate the expected values in (27) and (31). Notice that the approximations used in the sequel are the same as to those commonly used in the literature on standalone AFs [1], [2].

Additionally, the derivations for the steady-state local EMSE ζ_n in combinations without feedback are omitted for brevity. If necessary, they can be found in [1].

A. LMS + LMS

Steady-state results for the parallel-independent combination of two LMS filters are available in the literature [17], [20], although usually in stationary scenarios and not necessarily under the energy conservation argument from Section IV-C. It is, therefore, presented here for completeness. To get an LMS + LMS combination, take

$$g_n[x(i)] = x(i), \text{ for } n = 1, 2. \quad (36)$$

1) Without feedback: From the data model (1), notice that $e_n(i) = e_{a,n}(i) + v(i)$. Then, for (36), the covariance relation in (27c) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1\mu_2\, \mathrm{E}\, \|u_i\|^2 [e_{a,1}(i) + v(i)][e_{a,2}(i) + v(i)] + \mathrm{Tr}(Q) = \\ \mu_1\, \mathrm{E}\, e_{a,2}(i)\, [e_{a,1}(i) + v(i)] \\ + \mu_2\, \mathrm{E}\, e_{a,1}(i)\, [e_{a,2}(i) + v(i)], \text{ as } i \to \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

In order to proceed with the derivations, take the commonly used assumption [1]:

A.7 (*Data separation principle*) $\|u_i\|^2$ is independent of $e_{a,n}(i)$—and consequently $e_a(i)$—as $i \to \infty$.

The same assumption is used in the steady-state analysis of standalone LMS filters. Given the expected value of all terms linearly dependent on $v(i)$ will vanish under A.1, the steady-state EMSE and cross-EMSE for this combination can be expressed as

$$\zeta_n^{\{\text{LMS+LMS}\}} = \frac{\mu_n \sigma_v^2 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u) + \mu_n^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}(Q)}{2 - \mu_n \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)} \tag{38a}$$

$$\zeta_{12}^{\{\text{LMS+LMS}\}} = \frac{\mu_1 \mu_2 \sigma_v^2 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u) + \operatorname{Tr}(Q)}{\mu_1 + \mu_2 - \mu_1 \mu_2 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)}. \tag{38b}$$

Using (27a) and (35), the well-known closed-form expression for the steady-state of parallel-independent combinations of LMS filters is recovered [17], [20].

2) With feedback: For g_n as in (36) and noticing that the global output estimation error can be expressed as $e(i) = e_a(i) + v(i)$, (31) becomes

$$[\overline{\eta}\mu_1 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2]^2 \operatorname{E}\|u_i\|^2 [e_a(i) + v(i)]^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(Q) = 2[\overline{\eta}\mu_1 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2] \operatorname{E} e_a(i)[e_a(i) + v(i)], \text{ as } i \to \infty.$$

Again, a closed-form relation can be obtained using A.7. Explicitly,

$$\zeta^{f\{\text{LMS+LMS}\}} = \frac{\bar{\mu} \operatorname{Tr}(R_u) \sigma_v^2 + \bar{\mu}^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}(Q)}{2 - \bar{\mu} \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)}, \tag{39}$$

where $\bar{\mu} = \overline{\eta}\mu_1 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2$ is the steady-state *net step size* of the combination.

The stationary steady-state expressions (38) and (39) are compared to simulations in Figures 11 and 12. Notice that they are indeed accurate for $L = 1$ and $L \to \infty$. For $0 < L < \infty$, they hold as performance bounds and can be used to approximate the combination behavior.

Interestingly, (39) is equivalent to the expression for the steady-state of a stand-alone LMS filter with step size $\bar{\mu}$ [1, Lemma 7.5.1], as expected from the observations in Section III-A. Its performance is therefore better than that of the parallel-independent combination, specially in non-stationary scenarios. Indeed, as argued in [56], a parallel-independent combination of LMS filters can only match the tracking performance of a stand-alone LMS filter with optimal step size μ^o [1, Lemma 7.5.1] if at least one of its component has step size μ^o. In contrast, combinations with coefficients feedback are able to adjust $\bar{\mu} = \mu^o$ for any selection of component step sizes[6]. Moreover, since supervising rules of the form (18) minimize the global MSE, the supervising parameter will indeed track μ^o. The $\{\text{LMS} + \text{LMS}\}$ combination with cyclic coefficients feedback is therefore a viable alternative to other step size adaptation techniques, such as [10]–[13]. In fact, Figure 12 shows that a it is more robust to environment changes than the VSS-LMS from [11].

B. LMS + LMF

As argued in Section III-A, the unsupervised—i.e., with fixed η—LMS + LMF combination with coefficients feedback is equivalent to the LMMN algorithm proposed in [48]. Hence,

[6]This is actually the case for affine supervisors. Convex supervisors, on the other hand, require that $\mu_1 \leq \mu^o \leq \mu_2$.



Fig. 11. Steady-state analysis of the {LMS+LMS} combination. **Correlated stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 10$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-3}$, $\gamma = 0.8$, $\mu_1 = 0.01$, $\mu_2 = 0.002$; $\boldsymbol{L \to \infty}$: $\mu_a = 1000$ (convex supervisor); $\boldsymbol{L = 1}$: $\mu_\eta = 0.002$, $\beta = 0.9$, $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$, and $\eta_{min} = -0.2$ (normalized affine supervisor); $\boldsymbol{1 < L < \infty}$: $L = 3$, $\mu_\eta = 0.7$, $\beta = 0.9$, $\epsilon = 10^{-1}$, and $\eta_{min} = -0.2$ (normalized affine supervisor).



Fig. 12. Tracking analysis of the {LMS + LMS} combination. **White nonstationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 10$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$, $\sigma_q^2 = 10^{-4}$ $\mu_1 = 0.08$, and $\mu_2 = 0.005$; $\sigma_q^2 \to 10^{-5}$ at $i = 3000$ and $\sigma_q^2 \to 10^{-6}$ at $i = 6000$; $\boldsymbol{L \to \infty}$: $\mu_\eta = 0.3$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ (normalized convex supervisor); $\boldsymbol{1 < L < \infty}$: $L = 10$, $\mu_\eta = 0.3$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ (normalized convex supervisor); **VSS-LMS** [11]: $\mu(i) = 0.5 \cdot \mu(i-1) + 10^{-3} \cdot e^2(i)$, $\mu_{\max} = \mu_1$, and $\mu_{\min} = \mu_2$.

the following results are also valid for that algorithm. To analyze this combination, define the error non-linearities as

$$g_1[x(i)] = x(i) \quad \text{and} \quad g_2[x(i)] = x^3(i). \tag{40}$$

1) Without feedback: Substituting (40) in the covariance relation (27c) yields

$$\mu_1 \mu_2 \operatorname{E}\|u_i\|^2 [e_{a,1}(i) + v(i)][e_{a,2}(i) + v(i)]^3 + \operatorname{Tr}(Q) = \mu_1 \operatorname{E} e_{a,2}(i)[e_{a,1}(i) + v(i)] + \mu_2 \operatorname{E} e_{a,1}(i)[e_{a,2}(i) + v(i)]^3, \text{ as } i \to \infty. \tag{41}$$

To render the derivations more tractable, assume [1]

A.8 (*Higher-order moments approximation*) At steady-state, the $e_{a,n}$ are small enough so that their higher-order terms are negligible. Hence, $\operatorname{E} e_{a,1}^k(i) e_{a,2}^\ell(i) \approx 0$ for $k + \ell \geq 3$.

Then, under A.7 and taking the component filters to be stable and, therefore, asymptotically unbiased [1]—i.e., $\operatorname{E} e_{a,n}(i) \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$—, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{E}\|u_i\|^2 [e_{a,1}(i) + v(i)][e_{a,2}(i) + v(i)]^3 &\approx \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)\,[3\zeta_{12}\sigma_v^2 + 3\sigma_v^2 \zeta_2 + \xi_v^4\,] \\ \operatorname{E} e_{a,1}(i)[e_{a,2}(i) + v(i)]^3 &\approx 3\sigma_v^2 \zeta_{12}, \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where $\xi_v^4 = \operatorname{E} v^4(i)$. Using these results, (41) can be rearranged to read

$$\zeta_{12}^{\{\text{LMS+LMF}\}} = \frac{\mu_1 \mu_2 (3\sigma_v^2 \zeta_2 + \xi_v^4) \operatorname{Tr}(R_u) + \operatorname{Tr}(Q)}{\mu_1 + 3\mu_2 \sigma_v^2 - 3\mu_1 \mu_2 \sigma_v^2 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)}, \tag{43}$$

where

$$\zeta_2^{\{\text{LMS+LMF}\}} = \frac{\mu_2 \xi_v^6 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u) + \mu_2^{-1} \operatorname{Tr}(Q)}{6\sigma_v^2 - 15\mu_2 \xi_v^4 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)} \tag{44}$$

with $\xi_v^6 = \mathrm{E}\, v^6(i)$ [1, Lemma 7.8.1]. Together with (38a) and (35), these formulae provides all the necessary quantities to evaluate the steady-state global EMSE using (21). These results match those in [46], although they arise from the more general framework from Section IV.

2) With feedback: For g_n as in (40), the global variance relation (31) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2 \left\{\overline{\eta}\mu_1[e_a(i)+v(i)] + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2[e_a(i)+v(i)]^3\right\}^2 \\ + \operatorname{Tr}(Q) = \\ 2\overline{\eta}\mu_1\, \mathrm{E}\, e_a(i)[e_a(i)+v(i)] \\ +2(1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\, \mathrm{E}\, e_a(i)[e_a(i)+v(i)]^3, \text{ as } i \to \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Using A.7 and A.8 to obtain $\mathrm{E}[e_a(i)+v(i)]^4 \approx 6\sigma_v^2\zeta + \xi_v^4$ in addition to relations in (42), the global EMSE at steady-state of the LMS + LMF combination with coefficients feedback can be estimated using

$$\zeta^{f\{\text{LMS+LMF}\}} = \frac{\mathcal{N}}{\mathcal{D}} \tag{45}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N} &= \overline{\eta}\mu_1 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)[\overline{\eta}\mu_1\sigma_v^2 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\xi_v^4] \\ &\quad + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)[\overline{\eta}\mu_1\xi_v^4 + (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\xi_v^6] \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Tr}(Q) \\ \mathcal{D} &= 2[\overline{\eta}\mu_1 + 3(1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\sigma_v^2] \\ &\quad - \overline{\eta}\mu_1 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)[\overline{\eta}\mu_1 + 6(1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\sigma_v^2] \\ &\quad - (1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2 \operatorname{Tr}(R_u)[6\overline{\eta}\mu_1\sigma_v^2 + 15(1-\overline{\eta})\mu_2\xi_v^4]\end{aligned}$$

Figures 13 and 14 show the good fit of the steady-state models derived in this section. To motivate the use of the LMF algorithm, the simulations use uniformly distributed noises. In Figure 13, a combination using a large feedback cycle period is compared to a parallel-independent combination. Although the former displays an improved convergence behavior, they both achieve the same steady-state performance. Figure 14 shows a tracking analysis of the LMMN using an {LMS+LMF} combination with coefficients feedback. The optimal supervisor was evaluated from (45) and used as the mixing parameter δ in the LMMN recursion (12). Notice that its value is negative and that the combination exploits the cross-correlation between the AFs to yield almost a 1 dB gain over the best component.



Fig. 13. Steady-state analysis of the {LMS + LMF} combination. **White stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 10$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10$ (uniform), $\mu_{\text{LMS}} = 0.005$, $\mu_{\text{LMF}} = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-5}$; $\boldsymbol{L \to \infty}$: $\mu_a = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 1$ (normalized convex supervisor); $\mathbf{1 < L < \infty}$: $L = 500$, $\mu_a = 0.35$, $\beta = 0.8$, and $\epsilon = 1$ (normalized convex supervisor).



Fig. 14. Tracking analysis of the LMMN using an {LMS + LMS} combinations with coefficients feedback. **White nonstationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 10$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10$ (uniform), $sigma_q^2 = 10^{-4}$, $\mu_{\text{LMS}} = 0.002$, $\mu_{\text{LMF}} = 10^{-4}$; $\boldsymbol{L \to \infty}$: $\mu_a = 7$ (convex supervisor); $\boldsymbol{L = 1}$ **(LMMN)**: $\eta(i) = \eta^o = -1.34$, $\forall\, i$.

C. RLS + RLS

Recall from the beginning of Section IV that, as it stands, (17) does not account for RLS filters. In fact, to maintain the clarity of the derivations in the last sections, the analysis of combinations involving this algorithm is carried separately in the sequel. To do so, replace the scalar step size μ_n by $P_{n,i}$ defined in (4d) and take $g_n[x(i)] = x(i)$ in (17) to get

$$w_{n,i} = w_{n,a} + P_{n,i} u_i^T [d(i) - u_i w_{n,a}]. \tag{46}$$

In contrast to Sections IV-C and IV-D, analyses involving AF of the form (46) require the use of weighted variance and covariance relations. To do so, define the weighted norm of any vector x as $\|x\|_\Gamma^2 = x^T \Gamma x$, where Γ is a symmetric positive-definite matrix.

1) Without feedback: Subtracting (46) from w_i^o and using $w_{n,a} = w_{n,i-1}$ yields

$$\widetilde{w}_{n,i} = \widetilde{w}_{n,i-1} + q_i - P_{n,i} u_i^T e_n(i). \tag{47}$$

Taking the expected value of the product and cross-product of (47) weight by Γ then yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{n,i}\|_\Gamma^2 &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{n,i-1}\|_\Gamma^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Gamma) \\ &\quad - 2\,\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{n,i-1}^T \Gamma P_{n,i} u_i^T e_n(i) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2_{P_{n,i}^T \Gamma P_{n,i}} e_n^2(i) \qquad (48a) \\ \mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i}^T \Gamma \widetilde{w}_{2,i} &= \mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i-1}^T \Gamma \widetilde{w}_{2,i-1} + \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Gamma) \\ &\quad - \mathrm{E}\, u_i P_{1,i}^T \Gamma \widetilde{w}_{2,i-1} e_1(i) \\ &\quad - \mathrm{E}\, u_i P_{2,i}^T \Gamma \widetilde{w}_{1,i-1} e_2(i) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|_{P_{1,i}^T \Gamma P_{2,i}} e_1(i) e_2(i). \qquad (48b)\end{aligned}$$

where the nonstationary model A.2 was used.

To proceed, the following approximation is used as in the analysis of standalone RLS filters [1]

A.9 At steady-state, $\mathrm{E}\, P_{n,i} \approx \left[\mathrm{E}\, P_{n,i}^{-1}\right]^{-1} = (1-\lambda_n) R_u^{-1}$.

Moreover, notice that the local and global steady-state definitions Def. 1 and Def. 2 can be extended to weighted norms whenever the weighting matrix is deterministic and constant. Therefore, recalling that $e_n(i) = e_{a,n}(i) + v(i)$, choosing

$\Gamma = R_u$ in (48) yields

$$\zeta_n^{\{\text{RLS+RLS}\}} = \frac{(1-\lambda_n)M\sigma_v^2 + (1-\lambda_n)^{-1}\operatorname{Tr}(QR_u)}{2-(1-\lambda_n)M} \quad (49a)$$

$$\zeta_{12}^{\{\text{RLS+RLS}\}} = \frac{(1-\lambda_1)(1-\lambda_2)M\sigma_v^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(QR_u)}{2-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-(1-\lambda_1)(1-\lambda_2)M}. \quad (49b)$$

As in the previous sections, (49) can be used in conjunction with (35) and (21) to estimate the steady-state global EMSE.

2) With feedback: In the feedback case, a procedure similar to Section 31 can be followed, albeit using weighted norms. Hence, before proceeding, a weighted counterpart of (22) must be obtained. Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_i\|_\Gamma^2 &= \bar{\eta}^2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{1,i}\|_\Gamma^2 \\ &\quad + 2\bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta})\,\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i}^T\Gamma\widetilde{w}_{2,i} \\ &\quad + (1-\bar{\eta})^2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{2,i}\|_\Gamma^2.\end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Then, (46) can be subtracted from w_i^o when $w_{n,a} = w_{i-1}$ to get

$$\widetilde{w}_{n,i} = \widetilde{w}_{i-1} + q_i - P_{n,i}u_i^T e(i),$$

which under A.2 leads to the following weighted variance and covariance relations:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{n,i}\|_\Gamma^2 &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|_\Gamma^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Gamma) \\ &\quad - 2\,\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{i-1}^T\Gamma P_{n,i}u_i^T e(i) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2_{P_{n,i}^T\Gamma P_{n,i}} e^2(i) \quad (51a)\\ \mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i}^T\Gamma\widetilde{w}_{2,i} &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|_\Gamma^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Gamma) \\ &\quad - \mathrm{E}\,u_i P_{1,i}^T\Gamma\widetilde{w}_{i-1}e(i) \\ &\quad - \mathrm{E}\,u_i P_{2,i}^T\Gamma\widetilde{w}_{i-1}e(i) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|_{P_{1,i}^T\Gamma P_{2,i}} e^2(i). \quad (51b)\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the weighted counterpart of the global steady-state definition Def. 2 and approximation A.9, (51) can be substituted in (50) with $\Gamma = R_u$ to get

$$\zeta^{f\{\text{RLS+RLS}\}} = \frac{(1-\bar{\lambda})M\sigma_v^2 + (1-\bar{\lambda})^{-1}\operatorname{Tr}(QR_u)}{2-(1-\bar{\lambda})M}, \quad (52)$$

where $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\eta}\lambda_1 + (1-\bar{\eta})\lambda_2$. Notice that (52) is identical analysis of a standalone RLS with forgetting factor $\bar{\lambda}$ [1, Lemma 7.10.1]. The overall combination, however, is not equivalent to a variable forgetting factor algorithm (Figure 15). Indeed, it amounts to an RLS filter whose inverse Hessian approximation is $P_i = \eta(i)P_{1,i} + [1-\eta(i)]P_{2,i}$, which is different from some $P_{\text{eq},i}$ updated as in (4d) using $\lambda_{\text{eq}} = \eta(i)\lambda_1 + [1-\eta(i)]\lambda_2$. Nevertheless, the λ_{eq} of the combination displays the expected behavior, switching to a lower forgetting factor upon an abrupt change in the system (Figure 15b).

D. LMS + RLS

Notice that derivations similar to those in Section V-C can be used to analyze LMS+RLS combinations by replacing the matrix $P_{1,i}$ by $\mu_1 I$, where I is an appropriately sized identity matrix.



Fig. 15. Steady-state analysis of the {RLS+RLS} combination. **Correlated input data** (see Section I-A): $M = 10$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-3}$, $\gamma = 0.95$, $\lambda_1 = 0.92$, $\lambda_2 = 0.99$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$; $w^o \to -w^o$ at $i = 1000$; $\boldsymbol{L \to \infty}$: $\mu_a = 2$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ (normalized convex supervisor); $\boldsymbol{1 < L < \infty}$: $L = 30$, $\mu_a = 2.3$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$ (normalized convex supervisor); **Standalone with equivalent forgetting factor**: $\lambda(i) = \eta(i)\lambda_1 + [1-\eta(i)]\lambda_2$, where $\eta(i)$ is the instantaneous supervising parameter of the combination with coefficients feedback.

1) Without feedback: The parallel-independent case has been thoroughly studied in [21]. The results are reproduced here for reference. Indeed, formulae for the LMS and the RLS steady-state EMSE required to evaluate (21) can be found in (38a) and (49a), respectively. The steady-state cross-EMSE can be estimated using

$$\zeta_{12} = \mu_1(1-\lambda_2)\sigma_v^2\operatorname{Tr}(\Sigma^{-1}R_u) + \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Sigma^{-1}R_u), \quad (53)$$

where $\Sigma = \mu_1 R_u + (1-\lambda_2)I$ [21].

2) With feedback: In this case, replace $P_{1,i}$ by $\mu_1 I$ in (52) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{1,i}\|_\Gamma^2 &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|_\Gamma^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Gamma) \\ &\quad - 2\mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{i-1}^T\Gamma u_i^T[e_a(i)+v(i)] \\ &\quad + \mu_1^2\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|_\Gamma^2[e_a(i)+v(i)]^2 \quad (54a)\\ \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{2,i}\|_\Gamma^2 &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|_\Gamma^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Gamma) \\ &\quad - 2\,\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{i-1}^T\Gamma P_{2,i}u_i^T[e_a(i)+v(i)] \\ &\quad + \mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2_{P_{2,i}^T\Gamma P_{2,i}}[e_a(i)+v(i)]^2 \quad (54b)\\ \mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i}^T\Gamma\widetilde{w}_{2,i} &= \mathrm{E}\,\|\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\|_\Gamma^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Gamma) \\ &\quad - \mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i\Gamma\widetilde{w}_{i-1}[e_a(i)+v(i)] \\ &\quad - u_i\,\mathrm{E}\,P_{2,i}^T\Gamma\widetilde{w}_{i-1}[e_a(i)+v(i)] \\ &\quad + \mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|_{\Gamma P_{2,i}}[e_a(i)+v(i)]^2. \quad (54c)\end{aligned}$$

Using (54) in (50), the overall variance relation of the combination can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}&2\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i M^T\Gamma\widetilde{w}_{i-1}e_a(i) = \\ &\quad \operatorname{Tr}(Q\Gamma) + \bar{\eta}\mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2_{\Gamma M}[e_a(i)+v(i)]^2 \\ &\quad + (1-\bar{\eta})\,\mathrm{E}\,\|u_i\|^2_{M^T\Gamma P_{2,i}}[e_a(i)+v(i)]^2,\end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $M = \bar{\eta}\mu_1 I + (1-\bar{\eta})P_{2,i}$. Choosing $\Gamma = R_u H^{-1}$, for $H = \bar{\eta}\mu_1 R_u + (1-\bar{\eta})(1-\lambda_2)I$, and using the data separation principle A.7 and the approximation A.9, (55) reduces to a closed-form relation for the global EMSE at steady-state:

$$\zeta^{f\{\text{LMS+RLS}\}} = \frac{\operatorname{Tr}(H)\sigma_v^2 + \operatorname{Tr}(QR_uH^{-1})}{2-\operatorname{Tr}(H)}. \quad (56)$$

Figure 16 shows the accuracy of the expression in (55). It also illustrates well the performance improvements achieved at almost no additional cost when using coefficients feedback.



Fig. 16. Tracking analysis of the $\{\text{LMS}+\text{RLS}\}$ combination. **Correlated input data** (see Section I-A): $M=5$, $\sigma_u^2=1/M$, $\sigma_v^2=10^{-2}$, $\gamma=0.8$, $\mu_{\text{LMS}}=0.04$, $\lambda_{\text{RLS}}=0.92$, and $\epsilon=10^{-6}$; $Q_1=2\cdot10^{-6}\cdot R_u$, $Q_2=2\cdot10^{-6}\cdot R_u^{-1}$, $Q_3=2\cdot10^{-5}\cdot R_u$, and $Q_4=2\cdot10^{-5}\cdot R_u^{-1}$; **Parallel-independent**: $\mu_a=100$ (convex supervisor); **Cyclic coefficients feedback**: $L=25$ and $\mu_a=100$ (convex supervisor).

Indeed, taking the parallel-independent $w_i=w_{i-1}+\mu u_i^* e(i)+$ $w_i=w_{i-1}+P_i u_i^* e(i)$ in the same scenario as [21] and embedding a cyclic coefficients feedback ($L=25$) can improve tracking behavior by up to 2 dB.

VI. Transient Performance

Section IV revealed that coefficients feedback can be used to improve the steady-state and tracking of parallel combinations. Nevertheless, its initial motivation was addressing the convergence stagnation issue described in Section II-B. So as to determine its impact on the overall mixture convergence, this section examines the transient behavior of an LMS+LMS combination with cyclic coefficients feedback. In doing so, the impact of cyclic feedback on the supervisor variance is also investigated. Although analyses of convex and affine supervising rules in parallel-independent topologies have been carried out [32]–[34], [47], the following derivations are valid for general activation functions. Indeed, the approach from [33] is extended to any supervising rules of the form (18), to which the convex rule (9) and the affine rule (8) are special cases.

In the sequel, a stationary scenario is adopted—i.e., $q_i=0$ in (3)—, such that the coefficients errors from Section IV are redefined as $\widetilde{w}_i=w^o-w_i$ and $\widetilde{w}_{n,i}=w^o-w_{n,i}$ and the *a priori* errors become $e_a(i)=u_i\widetilde{w}_{i-1}$ and $e_{a,n}(i)=u_i\widetilde{w}_{n,i-1}$. Again, a supervisor separation principle is required to decouple its analyses from that of the component filters. Assumption A.3 is therefore extended for all i:

A.10 (*Transient supervisor separation principle*) The supervising parameter varies slowly enough that $\mathrm{E}[\eta(i)e_{a,m}(i)e_{a,n}(i)\,|\,\eta(i)]=\mathrm{E}\,\eta(i)\,\mathrm{E}[e_{a,m}(i)e_{a,n}(i)]$, $m,n=1,2$.

Here, however, no assumptions are made on the supervising parameter variance—as in A.4.

Under A.10 and for $q_i=0$, (20) can be rearranged to read

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(i)=\mathrm{E}\,\eta^2(i-1)[\Delta\zeta_1(i)+\Delta\zeta_2(i)]\\ -2\,\mathrm{E}\,\eta(i-1)\Delta\zeta_2(i)+\zeta_2(i),\end{aligned}\quad(57)$$

where $\Delta\zeta_n(i)=\zeta_n(i)-\zeta_{12}(i)$. The following two sections is then dedicated to finding recursions for $\zeta_n(i)$, $n=1,2$, $\zeta_{12}(i)$, and for the supervising parameters moments, so that (57) can be evaluated for all i. Interpretation of the results is deferred to Section VI-C so that the effect of cyclic coefficients feedback on components and supervisor can be analyzed simultaneously.

A. Components analysis

Before proceeding with the derivations of the local errors statistics recursions, assume

A.11 (*Data independence assumptions*) $\{u_i\}$ constitutes an i.i.d. sequence of vectors independent of $v(j)$, $\forall\, i,j$. Consequently, $\{u_i,\widetilde{w}_j\}$, $\{d(i),d(j)\}$, and $\{u_i,d(j)\}$ are independent for $i>j$.

Note that in some cases—e.g., when $u(i)$ are i.i.d. and the regressor is updated in parallel—, A.11 is exact. Still, although it is stronger than A.7, this assumption is common in transient analyses [1], [2] and yields good match with simulations—see Section I-A.

Under A.11, it holds from the definition of the *a priori* error that

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_n(i)&=\mathrm{E}\,u_i\widetilde{w}_{n,i-1}\widetilde{w}_{n,i-1}^T u_i^T=\mathrm{Tr}(R_u K_{n,i-1})\\ \zeta_{12}(i)&=\mathrm{E}\,u_i\widetilde{w}_{1,i-1}\widetilde{w}_{2,i-1}^T u_i^T=\mathrm{Tr}(R_u K_{12,i-1})\\ \zeta(i)&=\mathrm{E}\,u_i\widetilde{w}_{i-1}\widetilde{w}_{i-1}^T u_i^T=\mathrm{Tr}(R_u K_{i-1}),\end{aligned}\quad(58)$$

where $K_{n,i}=\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{n,i}\widetilde{w}_{n,i}^T$, $K_{12,i}=K_{21,i}^T=\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{1,i}\widetilde{w}_{2,i}^T$, and $K_i=\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_i\widetilde{w}_i^T$, are covariance and cross-covariance matrices of the coefficients errors. Due to the linearity of the trace operator [57], it also holds that $\Delta\zeta_n(i)=\mathrm{Tr}(R_u\Delta K_{n,i-1})$ with $\Delta K_{n,i}=K_{n,i}-K_{12,i}$. For the combination of interest, these matrices can be derived from the general AF recursion (17), with $g_n[x(i)]=x(i)$, and the cyclic feedback definition (11). Defining $K_{n,a}=\mathrm{E}\,\widetilde{w}_{n,a}\widetilde{w}_{n,a}^T$:

$$\begin{aligned}K_{n,i}&=K_{n,a}-\mu_n K_{n,a}\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i-\mu_n\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i K_{n,a}^T\\ &\quad+\mu_n^2\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i K_{n,a} u_i^T u_i+\mu_n^2\sigma_v^2\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i\end{aligned}\quad(59a)$$

$$\begin{aligned}K_{12,i}&=K_{12,a}-\mu_2 K_{12,a}\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i-\mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i K_{12,a}^T\\ &\quad+\mu_1\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i K_{12,a} u_i^T u_i+\mu_1\mu_2\sigma_v^2\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i\end{aligned}\quad(59b)$$

$$K_{n,a}=\delta(i-rL)K_{i-1}+[1-\delta(i-rL)]\,K_{n,i-1}\quad(60a)$$

$$K_{12,a}=\delta(i-rL)K_{i-1}+[1-\delta(i-rL)]\,K_{12,i-1}\quad(60b)$$

First, consider the case upon feedback, when $i=rL$ in the feedback relations (60). Then, (59) yields, for $n=1,2$,

$$\begin{aligned}K_{n,i}&=K_{i-1}-\mu_n[K_{i-1}R_u+R_u K_{i-1}]\\ &\quad+\mu_n^2\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i K_{i-1} u_i^T u_i+\mu_n^2\sigma_v^2 R_u\end{aligned}\quad(61a)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta K_{1,i}&=(\mu_2-\mu_1)\big[\,K_{i-1}R_u\\ &\quad-\mu_1\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i K_{i-1} u_i^T u_i-\mu_1\sigma_v^2 R_u\,\big]\end{aligned}\quad(61b)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta K_{2,i}&=(\mu_1-\mu_2)[\,R_u K_{i-1}^T\\ &\quad-\mu_2\,\mathrm{E}\,u_i^T u_i K_{i-1} u_i^T u_i-\mu_2\sigma_v^2 R_u\,]\end{aligned}\quad(61c)$$

To account for arbitrary coloring of the input signal, define the eigenvalue decomposition (EVD) of the input regressor covariance matrix as $R_u=Q\Lambda Q^T$. Given that the trace

operator is invariant to similarity transformations [57], the following relations hold from (58):

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_n(i) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda \bar{K}_{n,i-1}) \\ \zeta_{12}(i) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda \bar{K}_{12,i-1}) \\ \Delta\zeta_n(i) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda \Delta\bar{K}_{n,i-1})\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where for any matrix H: $\bar{H} = Q^T H Q$. Then, from (61),

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{K}_{n,i} &= \bar{K}_{i-1} - \mu_n[\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda + \Lambda\bar{K}_{i-1}] \\ &\quad + \mu_n^2\, \mathrm{E}\, \bar{u}_i^T \bar{u}_i \bar{K}_{i-1} \bar{u}_i^T \bar{u}_i + \mu_n^2 \sigma_v^2 \Lambda \\ \Delta\bar{K}_{1,i} &= (\mu_2 - \mu_1)\big[\, \bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda \\ &\quad - \mu_1\, \mathrm{E}\, \bar{u}_i^T \bar{u}_i \bar{K}_{i-1} \bar{u}_i^T \bar{u}_i - \mu_1 \sigma_v^2 \Lambda \,\big] \\ \Delta\bar{K}_{2,i} &= (\mu_1 - \mu_2)\big[\, \Lambda\bar{K}_{i-1}^T \\ &\quad - \mu_2\, \mathrm{E}\, \bar{u}_i^T \bar{u}_i \bar{K}_{i-1} \bar{u}_i^T \bar{u}_i - \mu_2 \sigma_v^2 \Lambda \,\big]\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{u}_i = u_i Q$. Since the covariance matrix of $\bar{u}_i$ is diagonal—namely $\mathrm{E}\, \bar{u}_i^T \bar{u}_i = \Lambda$—, the fourth-order relation from [1] can be used to get

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{K}_{n,i} &= \bar{K}_{i-1} - \mu_n[\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda + \Lambda\bar{K}_{i-1}] \\ &\quad + \mu_n^2 \left[\Lambda\, \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda) + 2\Lambda\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda\right] \\ &\quad + \mu_n^2 \sigma_v^2 \Lambda \qquad (63a) \\ \Delta\bar{K}_{1,i} &= (\mu_2 - \mu_1)\big\{\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda \\ &\quad - \mu_1 \left[\Lambda\, \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda) + 2\Lambda\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda\right] \\ &\quad - \mu_1 \sigma_v^2 \Lambda\big\} \qquad (63b) \\ \Delta\bar{K}_{2,i} &= (\mu_1 - \mu_2)\big\{\Lambda\bar{K}_{i-1}^T \\ &\quad - \mu_2 \left[\Lambda\, \mathrm{Tr}(\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda) + 2\Lambda\bar{K}_{i-1}\Lambda\right] \\ &\quad - \mu_2 \sigma_v^2 \Lambda\big\} \qquad (63c)\end{aligned}$$

Recursions for the error statistics required to evaluate (58) upon feedback can be obtained from (62) and (63). For instance, when the input signal is white—$R_u = \sigma_u^2 I$—, the local EMSE recursions are expressed by

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_n(i) &= [1 - 2\mu_n\sigma_u^2 + \mu_n^2(M+2)\sigma_u^4]\zeta(i-1) \qquad (64a) \\ &\quad + \mu_n^2 M \sigma_u^4 \sigma_v^2 \\ \Delta\zeta_n(i) &= (\mu_m - \mu_n)\sigma_u^2[1 - \mu_n(M+2)\sigma_u^2]\zeta(i-1) \qquad (64b) \\ &\quad + \mu_n(\mu_n - \mu_m) M \sigma_u^4 \sigma_v^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta(i-1)$ is evaluated using (57).

Finally, when there is no feedback—i.e., when $i \neq rL$ in (60)—the closed form of (59) reduces to those well-known in the literature for standalone AFs and parallel-independent combinations [2], [32], [34]. Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{K}_{n,i} &= \bar{K}_{n,i-1} - \mu_n[\bar{K}_{n,i-1}\Lambda + \Lambda\bar{K}_{n,i-1}] \\ &\quad + \mu_n^2[2\Lambda\bar{K}_{n,i-1}\Lambda + \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\bar{K}_{n,i-1})\Lambda] \qquad (65a) \\ &\quad + \mu_n^2 \sigma_v^2 \Lambda \\ \bar{K}_{12,i} &= \bar{K}_{12,i-1} - \mu_1\Lambda\bar{K}_{12,i-1} - \mu_2\bar{K}_{12,i-1}\Lambda \\ &\quad + \mu_1\mu_2[2\Lambda\bar{K}_{12,i-1}\Lambda + \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\bar{K}_{12,i-1})\Lambda] \qquad (65b) \\ &\quad + \mu_1\mu_2\sigma_v^2\Lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Once again, the recursions for the quantities in (57) obtained from (65) are illustrated for the white input signal case. Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_n(i) &= [1 - 2\mu_n\sigma_u^2 + \mu_n^2(M+2)\sigma_u^4]\zeta_n(i-1) \qquad (66a) \\ &\quad + \mu_n^2 M \sigma_u^4 \sigma_v^2 \\ \Delta\zeta_n(i) &= [1 - \mu_n\sigma_u^2]\Delta\zeta_n(i-1) \qquad (66b) \\ &\quad - \sigma_u^2[1 - \mu_n(M+2)\sigma_u^2][\mu_n\zeta_n(i-1) - \mu_m\zeta_{12}(i-1)] \\ &\quad + \mu_n(\mu_n - \mu_m) M \sigma_u^4 \sigma_v^2\end{aligned}$$

B. Supervisor analysis

Similar to [33], the activation function f is approximated by a first order Taylor expansion around $\bar{a}(i-1) = \mathrm{E}\, a(i-1)$:

$$\eta(i-1) = f[a(i-1)] \approx \bar{f} + \bar{f}' \cdot [a(i-1) - \bar{a}(i-1)]\,, \tag{67}$$

where for any function h: $\bar{h} = h\,[\bar{a}(i-1)]$. Using (67), the supervising parameters moments in (57) become

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\, \eta^2(i-1) &\approx \bar{f}^2 + \sigma_a^2(i-1)[\bar{f}']^2 \\ \mathrm{E}\, \eta(i-1) &\approx \bar{f},\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

taking $\sigma_a^2(i) = \mathrm{E}\,[a(i) - \bar{a}(i)]^2$ as the variance of the auxiliary parameter a. Notice that (68) is expressed in terms of moments of $a(i-1)$, for which recursions are derived in the sequel.

Recall that an approximate recursion for a was derived in Section IV-E also by relying on first order approximations, namely (33). The only distinction here is that instead of the steady-state supervisor separation principle A.3, the more stringent assumption A.10 is necessary to find mean and variance recursions that hold for all i. Additionally, the following assumption is required to evaluate the necessary *a priori* errors moments:

A.12 (*Jointly Gaussian* a priori *errors*) The *a priori* error $\{e_{a,n}(i)\}$, $n = 1, 2$, are zero-mean jointly Gaussian random variables, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\, e_{a,n}^4 &= 3\zeta_n^2 \\ \mathrm{E}\, e_{a,1}^k e_{a,2}^\ell &= \begin{cases} 0, & k+\ell = 3 \\ 3\zeta_1\zeta_{12}, & k = 3, \ell = 1 \\ 3\zeta_2\zeta_{12}, & k = 1, \ell = 3 \\ 2\zeta_{12}^2 + \zeta_1\zeta_2, & k = \ell = 2 \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

This assumption is accurate for small step-sizes and long filters—large M—even when the inputs are not normally distributed due to the central limit theorem [1]. Finally, evaluating the expected value of (33) and its square, the necessary supervisor recursions read

$$\bar{a}(i) \approx \bar{a}(i-1) + \mu_a[(1-\bar{f})\Delta\zeta_2 - \bar{f}\Delta\zeta_1]\bar{f}' \tag{69a}$$

$$\sigma_a^2(i) \approx [\,1 + 2\mu_a\mathcal{B}_1 + \mu_a^2\mathcal{B}_2\,]\sigma_a^2(i-1) + \mu_a^2\mathcal{B}_v \tag{69b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_1 &= [(1-\bar{f})\Delta\zeta_2 - \bar{f}\Delta\zeta_1]\bar{f}'' - [\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2](\bar{f}')^2 \\ \mathcal{B}_2 &= 3(\bar{f}')^4(\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2)^2 + (\bar{f}'')^2[\zeta_2(\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2) + 2\Delta\zeta_2^2] \\ &\quad + 3\bar{f}(\bar{f}'')^2(\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2)[\bar{f}\Delta\zeta_1 - (2-\bar{f})\Delta\zeta_2] \\ &\quad + 6(\bar{f}')^2\bar{f}''(\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2)[\bar{f}\Delta\zeta_1 - (1-\bar{f})\Delta\zeta_2] \\ &\quad + (\bar{f}'')^2(\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2)\sigma_v^2 \\ \mathcal{B}_v &= (\bar{f}')^2\left\{\Delta\zeta_2^2 + (\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2) \times \right. \\ &\qquad \left.\left[\,2\bar{f}^2(\Delta\zeta_1 + \Delta\zeta_2) - 4\bar{f}\Delta\zeta_2 + \zeta_2 + \sigma_v^2\,\right]\right\},\end{aligned}$$

Note that, for appropriate choices of f, the result for the convex supervisor from [33] is recovered. For the affine supervisor, however, these results differ from the previous literature. Indeed, [55] assumes that the mean supervisor parameter is identical to the optimal one, while [47] relies on a different scheme and does not explicitly evaluate these quantities. Finally, algebraic mistakes in the derivation make the second-order model in [32, (48)] inconsistent, as it can result in the estimation of supervisor variances that are negative.

C. Complete transient analysis

Combining the results from Sections VI-A and VI-B, a complete transient model for the $\{\text{LMS}+\text{LMS}\}$ combination with cyclic coefficients feedback can be obtained. To do so, the components model (63) and (65) are alternated depending on whether feedback occurs during the iteration. The full model is illustrated in the sequel for the i.i.d. input sequence case, although its generalization to arbitrarily colored $\{u(i)\}$ is straightforward.

Assuming the component coefficients and the supervisor are initialized with $w_{n,-1} = 0$ and $a(-1) = 0$, respectively, the transient analysis start with $\zeta_n(-1) = \zeta_{12}(-1) = \sigma_u^2\|w^o\|^2$ and iterates through:

i. Update the errors statistics using: $\begin{cases}(64), & i = rL\\ (66), & i \neq rL\end{cases}$
ii. Evaluate the supervising parameter moments using (68)
iii. Evaluate the global EMSE using (57)
iv. Update the supervisor statistics using (69)

The validity of this model is illustrated for a convex and affine supervisor in Figures 17 and 18. Notice that, due to the first-order approximation, the variance model in 17e is not as precise as that in 18, although both display the same tendencies as the simulations. Only when the supervising parameter is switching does the model overestimates the parameter variance to the point of affecting the global EMSE model.

The results in this section show the advantages of using of cyclic coefficients feedback in parallel combinations from a transient behavior viewpoint. Firstly, notice from (64) that feeding back the global coefficients makes all local EMSEs become functions of the global EMSE $\zeta(i-1)$. In doing so, the convergence stagnation issue is eradicated, since the difference between the components errors cannot grow large (for appropriate cycle periods). This effect is evident when looking at (b) and (c) in Figures 17 and 18. Indeed, upon feedback, the difference between the $\zeta_n(i)$ is proportional to the difference between the components step sizes.

Secondly, note that (60) implies that $\Delta\zeta_n(i-1)$ vanishes upon feedback, since $\zeta_n(i-1) = \zeta_{12}(i-1) = \zeta(i-1)$. Thus, the EMSE/cross-EMSE gap is reduced, which from (69b) points to a reduction in the supervising parameter variance compared to other topologies and, ultimately, an improved stability and performance (Figure 19). Nevertheless, if the cycle period is not correctly designed, the feedbacks can hinder the stability of the supervisor (Figure 18e).

Finally, the mean supervising parameter model (69a) explicitly reveals how coefficients feedback stalls the supervisor adaptation. This fact justifies the use of *cyclic* feedback, so that the combination can exploit the reduction in the supervisor variance and avoid convergence stagnation without hindering the tracking of the optimal supervisor (Figures 17c and 18c).



Fig. 17. Transient analysis of the $\{\text{LMS}+\text{LMS}\}$ combination with a convex supervisor. **White stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 10$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$, $\mu_1 = 0.05$, $\mu_2 = 0.005$; **Parallel-independent**: $\mu_a = 170$ (convex supervisor); **Cyclic coefficients feedback**: $L = 100$ and $\mu_a = 250$ (convex supervisor).

VII. Conclusion

This paper proposed a new structure for the combination of adaptive filters by making use of cyclic coefficients feedbacks. This novel topology was used to pose mixed norm, data reusing, and variable step size standalone adaptive algorithms as combinations, which allows their performance to be improved. Steady-state, tracking, and transient analyses showed how cyclic coefficients feedback can improve performance of combinations by addressing the convergence stagnation issue, reducing tracking misadjustment, and reduce the supervising parameter variance. Numerical simulations illustrated the good fit of the derived models and showed that existing parallel combinations can be effectively and efficiently improved using the techniques described in this work.

References

[1] A. Sayed, *Adaptive filters*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 2008.
[2] P. Diniz, *Adaptive filtering: Algorithms and practical implementation*, 4th ed. Springer, 2013.



Fig. 18. Transient analysis of the $\{\text{LMS}+\text{LMS}\}$ combination with an affine supervisor. **White stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 7$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$, $\mu_1 = 0.05$, $\mu_2 = 0.01$; **Parallel-independent**: $\mu_\eta = 1$ and $\eta_{\min} = -0.25$; **Cyclic coefficients feedback**: $L = 60$, $\mu_\eta = 1.4$, and $\eta_{\min} = -0.25$.



Fig. 19. Effect of different topologies on the supervisor performance (normalized convex supervisor). **White stationary scenario** (see Section I-A): $M = 10$, $\sigma_u^2 = 1$, $\sigma_v^2 = 10^{-2}$, $\mu_1 = 0.05$, $\mu_2 = 0.005$; **Parallel-independent**: $\mu_a = 1$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$; **Coefficients leakage**: $\alpha = 0.6$ for $\eta \geq 0.98$ and $\alpha = 0$ otherwise, $\mu_a = 2.5$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$; **Coefficients handover**: $L = 10$, $\mu_a = 3$, $\beta = 0.9$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$; **Cyclic coefficients feedback**: $L = 80$, $\mu_a = 4$, $\beta = 0.8$, and $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$.

[3] V. Nascimento and J. Bermudez, "Probability of divergence for the least-mean fourth algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 54[4], pp. 1376–1385, 2006.

[4] M. Tsakiris and C. Lopes, "A robust affine projection algorithm with feedback compensation of the condition number," in *International Conference in Acoustic, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 2009, pp. 2057–2060.

[5] S. Shaffer and C. Williams, "Comparison of LMS, alpha LMS, and data reusing LMS algorithms," in *Asilomar Conference on Circuits, Systems, and Computers*, 1983, pp. 260–264.

[6] B. Schnaufer and W. Jenkins, "New data-reusing LMS algorithms for improved convergence," in *Asilomar Conf. on Signals, Syst. and Comput.*, 1993, pp. 1584–1588.

[7] J. A. Jr., M. Campos, and P. Diniz, "Convergence analysis of the bi-normalized data-reusing LMS algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 48[11], pp. 3235–3242, 2000.

[8] R. Soni, K. Gallivan, and W. Jenkins, "Low-complexity data reusing methods in adaptive filtering," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 52[2], pp. 394–405, 2004.

[9] H.-C. Shin, W.-J. Song, and A. Sayed, "Mean-square performance of data-reusing adaptive algorithms," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 12[12], pp. 851–854, 2005.

[10] R. Harris, D. Chabries, and F. Bishop, "Variable step (VS) adaptive filter algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 34, pp. 309–316, 1986.

[11] R. Kwong and E. Johnston, "A variable step size LMS algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 40[7], pp. 1633–1642, 1992.

[12] V. Mathews and Z. Xie, "A stochastic gradient adaptive filter with gradient adaptive step size," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 41[6], pp. 2075–2087, 1993.

[13] K. Mayyas and T. Aboulnasr, "A robust variable step size LMS-type algorithm: Analysis and simulations," in *ICASSP*, 1995, pp. 1408–1411.

[14] H.-C. Shin, A. Sayed, and W.-J. Song, "Variable step-size NLMS and affine projection algorithms," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 11, pp. 132–135, 2004.

[15] A. Singer and M. Feder, "Universal linear prediction by model order weighting," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 47[10], pp. 2685–2699, 1999.

[16] S. Kozat and A. Singer, "Further results in multistage adaptive filtering," in *ICASSP*, 2002, pp. 1329–1332.

[17] J. Arenas-García, A. Figueiras-Vidal, and A. Sayed, "Mean-square performance of a convex combination of two adaptive filters," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 54[3], pp. 1078–1090, 2006.

[18] Y. Zhang and J. Chambers, "Convex combination of adaptive filters for a variable tap-length LMS algorithm," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 13[10], pp. 628–631, 2006.

[19] C. Lopes, E. Satorius, P. Estabrook, and A. Sayed, "Efficient adaptive carrier tracking for Mars to Earth communications during entry, descent and landing," in *SSP*, 2007, pp. 517–521.

[20] N. Bershad, J. Bermudez, and J.-Y. Tourneret, "An affine combination of two LMS adaptive filters—transient mean-square analysis," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56[5], pp. 1853—-1864, 2008.

[21] M. Silva and V. Nascimento, "Improving the tracking capability of adaptive filters via convex combination," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56[7], pp. 3137—-3149, 2008.

[22] J. Arenas-García and A. Figueiras-Vidal, "Adaptive combination of IPNLMS filters for robust sparse echo cancellation," in *MLSP*, 2008, pp. 221–226.

[23] C. Lopes, E. Satorius, P. Estabrook, and A. Sayed, "Adaptive carrier tracking for Mars to Earth communications during entry, descent, and landing," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 46[4], pp. 1865–1879, 2010.

[24] L. Azpicueta-Ruiz, M. Zeller, A. Figueiras-Vidal, J. Arenas-García, and W. Kellermann, "Adaptive combination of Volterra kernels and its application to nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation," vol. 19[1], pp. 97–110, 2011.

[25] W. Lopes and C. Lopes, "Incremental-cooperative strategies in combination of adaptive filters," in *ICASSP*, 2011, pp. 4132–4135.

[26] L. Chamon, W. Lopes, and C. Lopes, "Combination of adaptive filters with coefficients feedback," in *ICASSP*, 2012, pp. 3785–3788.

[27] L. Chamon, H. Ferro, and C. Lopes, "A data reusage algorithm based on incremental combination of LMS filters," in *Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, 2012.
[28] V. Nascimento and R. de Lamare, "A low-complexity strategy for speeding up the convergence of convex combinations of adaptive filters," in *ICASSP*, 2012, pp. 3553–3556.
[29] W. Lopes and C. Lopes, "Incremental combination of RLS and LMS adaptive filters in nonstationary scenarios," 2013, *Accepted in ICASSP*.
[30] H. Ferro, L. Chamon, and C. Lopes, "FIR-IIR adaptive filters hybrid combination," *IET Electronics Letters*, vol. 50[7], pp. 501–503, 2014.
[31] L. Chamon and C. Lopes, "There's plenty of room at the bottom: Incremental combinations of sign-error LMS filters," in *International Conference in Acoustic, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2014.
[32] R. Candido, M. Silva, and V. Nascimento, "Transient and steady-state analysis of the affine combination of two adaptive filters," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58[8], pp. 4064–4078, 2010.
[33] V. Nascimento, M. Silva, R. Candido, and J. Arenas-García, "A transient analysis for the convex combination of adaptive filters," in *SSP*, 2009, pp. 53–56.
[34] M. Silva, V. Nascimento, and J. Arenas-García, "A transient analysis for the convex combination of two adaptive filters with transfer of coefficients," in *ICASSP*, 2010, pp. 3842—-3845.
[35] L. Azpicueta-Ruiz, A. Figueiras-Vidal, and J. Arenas-García, "A normalized adaptation scheme for the convex combination of two adaptive filters," in *ICASSP*, 2008, pp. 3301–3304.
[36] L. Chamon and C. Lopes, "Transient performance of an incremental combination of LMS filters," in *European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, 2013, pp. 1–5.
[37] ——, "On parallel-incremental combinations of LMS filters that outperform the Affine Projection Algorithm," in *Symposium of the Brazilian Telecommunications Society*, 2013.
[38] J. Choia, S. Kima, and S. Kima, "Adaptive combination of affine projection and NLMS algorithms," *Signal Processing*, vol. 100, pp. 64–70, 2014.
[39] L. Arévalo, R. Sampaio-Neto, J. Apolinário, and M. Campos, "Convex combination of three affine projections adaptive filters," in *ISWCS*, 2013.
[40] M. Ferrer, M. de Diego, A. Gonzalez, and G. Piñero, "Convex combination of affine projection algorithms," in *European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, 2009, pp. 431–435.
[41] Y. Huang, J. Benesty, and J. Chen, *Acoustic MIMO Signal Processing*. Springer, 2006.
[42] H. So and P. Ching, "Comparative study of five LMS-based adaptive time delay estimators," *IEE Proc. Radar, Sonar and Nav.*, vol. 148[1], pp. 9–15, 2001.
[43] L. Chamon and C. Lopes, "Combination of adaptive filters for relative navigation," in *European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, 2011, pp. 1771–1775.
[44] B. Widrow and E. Walach, *Adaptive inverse control: a signal processing approach*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 2008.
[45] K. Ogata, *Modern Control Engineering*. Prentice Hall, 2009.
[46] S. Kozat, A. Singer, A. Erdogan, and A. Sayed, "Unbiased model combinations for adaptive filtering," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58[8], pp. 4421–4427, 2010.
[47] S. Kozat, A. Erdogan, A. Singer, and A. Sayed, "Transient analysis of adaptive affine combinations," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59[12], pp. 6227–6232, 2011.
[48] J. Chambers, O. Tanrikulu, and A. Constantinides, "Least mean mixed-norm adaptive filtering," *IET Electronics Letters*, vol. 30[19], pp. 1574–1575, 1994.
[49] D. Pazaitis and A. Constantinides, "LMS+F algorithm," *IET Electronics Letters*, vol. 31[7], pp. 1423–1424, 1995.
[50] ——, "An intelligent LMS+F algorithm," in *Signal Process. Workshop on Statistical Signal and Array Process.*, 1996, pp. 486–489.
[51] J. Chambers and A. Avlonitis, "A robust mixed-norm adaptive filter algorithm," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 4[2], pp. 46–48, 1997.
[52] J. Benesty and S. Gay, "An improved PNLMS algorithm," in *International Conference in Acoustic, Speech, and Signal Processing*. IEEE, 2002, pp. 1881–1884.
[53] M. Nekuii and M. Atarodi, "A fast converging algorithm for network echo cancellation," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 11[4], pp. 427–430, 2004.
[54] D. Bertsekas, "A new class of incremental gradient methods for least squares problems," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 7[4], pp. 913–926, 1997.
[55] R. Candido, M. Silva, and V. Nascimento, "Affine combinations of adaptive filters," in *Asilomar Conference on Signals, Syst. and Comput.*, 2008, pp. 236–240.
[56] V. Nascimento, M. Silva, L. Azpicueta-Ruiz, and J. Arenas-Garcia, "On the tracking performance of combinations of least mean squares and recursive least squares adaptive filters," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics Speech and Signal Processing*, 2010, pp. 3710–3713.
[57] R. Horn and C. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.